

Steering Committee Minutes August 28, 2008

Steering Committee Members

Abby King	Borrego Springs
Chris Noland	Boulevard
Bev Esry	Campo/Lake Morena
Jack Vandover	Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/ Granite Hills
Kathy Goddard	Cuyamaca
Harry Christianson	Fallbrook
Robert Frey	Hidden Meadows
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Dan Neirinckx	Jamul/Dulzura
Jack Shelver	Julian
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Joe Chism	Pala-Pauma
Lucille Goodman	Pine Valley
Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Carl Meyer	Potrero
Jim Anderson	Rainbow
Helene Radzik	Ramona
Lora Lowes	Spring Valley
Liz Stonehouse	Sweetwater
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks
Jack Phillips	Valle de Oro
Oliver Smith	Valley Center

Planning Commission

Bryan Woods, Planning Commissioner

Staff

Devon Muto, Chief
Bob Citrano, DPLU Staff
Eric Lardy, DPLU Staff
Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff
Christine Wang, DPLU Staff
Rachel Bramstedt, DPLU Staff

Public

Charlene Ayers	Ranters Roost	Ron Dahlgren	Interested Property Owner
Doug Paul	Star Ranch – Campo	Sachiko Kohatsu	Board of Supervisors
Hank Palmer	Twin Oaks CSG		District Three
Jake Christie	East County Californian	Tom Weber	Borrego Springs
Janet Warren	Potrero CPG	William Crawley	Potrero CPG
Rikki Schroeder	RMA		

Meeting Commenced at 9:02 a.m.

I. Introductions

Mr. Woods called the meeting to order and asked the group to go around the table to introduce themselves. Following introductions, Mr. Woods asked Mr. Muto to give announcements from the General Plan Update Group.

Mr. Muto announced that staff is working hard to trying to get the Draft General Plan out by the end of this year, ahead of the schedule which has it going out in early 2009. He added that staff is making progress on the Draft Environmental Impact Report, that it is going to be very thorough and address every issue that is needed to be addressed. He noted that the schedule includes the Draft Environmental Impact Report going for public review in the late 2009, but that if possible it will be released earlier and have more time to respond to comments.

Mr. Muto stated that Community Plan Workshops were held at the end of July, adding that they were well attended and contained good discussion. He explained that hopefully those groups that are pursuing Options Two and Three were making progress on their Draft Community Plans for the September 30th deadline for deliverables on the Community Plans. Mr. Muto gave an update on SB 375, the Sustainable Communities Bill that could make substantial changes to the planning process in California. He explained that the County had some concerns with the initial legislation, but worked with the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and SANDAG to suggest changes. He noted that recent edits to the bill improved it and that the implementation of Smart Growth on a Regional Basis could help the Unincorporated County by directing development pressures to the Incorporated Cities, not the Rural Areas.

Mr. Meyer asked if he can get a copy of the comments from the County of San Diego. Mr. Muto responded that the comments from CSAC are available on the website. A woman from audience commented that www.leginfo.com has information about the Bill.

Mr. Muto gave an update on population numbers that were released by SANDAG in July 2008, and that the numbers showed a spike in the unincorporated county. He stated that staff is looking into the details, but that the number of units is comparable and that one of the reasons for the spike in population because the Persons Per Household and vacancy rates change. Mr. Muto added that Staff is working to understand the rational for the changes and see if it makes sense, noting that he does not see this projection changing the General Plan Update Process.

Additionally, Mr. Muto noted that there was an article in the East County Californian in August titled “County Planning Groups unhappy with DPLU General Plan and Managers”. He mentioned that he does not think that this is a global issue, but added that his door is always open to listen to concerns about the General Plan or the Process. Mr. Muto also

added that he feels there have been good changes in the last year with the General Plan Update project in the last year, with over 7 Steering Committee Meetings.

Mr. Muto stated that there are two major items on the agenda, the Conservation Subdivision Program from the June Steering Committee Meeting, and some follow up with the Land Use Element from previous discussions. He said that we did receive some requests for agenda items but thinks they can be addressed outside of the group to keep the agenda concise.

II. **Action Item:** Approve minutes from July 26, 2008 Steering Committee Meeting.

Mr. Woods asked the group if everyone had a chance to review the Minutes and asked for any comments or corrections. Mr. Phillips stated that they were excellent minutes.

Phillips: Move Approval

R. Smith: Second

Motion Passes 19-0-1

III. Discussion of Draft Conservation Subdivision Program

Mr. Woods stated that the Conservation Subdivisions Proposal was the next item on the agenda. Mr. Muto stated to the group that Draft Conservation Subdivision Proposal handout presented on June 20, 2008 is at the back that the Conservation Subdivision Program is being presented with additional information for discussion by the Steering Committee. Mr. Muto clarified that the Target Minimum lot sizes in Section 3 Accommodating Flexibility in Subdivision Design (page 4) are an example of what can be used areas fit for conservation subdivisions, not what will be applied across the board. He noted that under the Draft Program it is expected that said that the Planned Residential Developments (PRD) and Lot Area Averaging will be the primary mechanisms used for a Conservation Subdivision design, and added that these require findings and comments from the Community Planning or Sponsor Groups.

Mr. Muto stated that he would like to walk through how we were considering to amend the Zoning for the Conservation Subdivision Program. He asked the group to look at the August 23, 2008 Conservation Subdivision Program Handouts, and explained three scenarios of possible Zoning Changes to minimum lot size. The first scenario is where a property receives a similar density, the second where the property receives a decreased density and lastly a scenario where a property receives an increased density. It was explained that the minimum lot sizes would only be decreased in certain areas with Community Planning/Sponsor Group input, and only then would a conservation subdivision be allowed by-right.

Mr. Chism asked about an example where two 4 acre lots were allowed on a 40 acre parcel with a Density of Rural Lands 20, wanting to know how the third lot is protected. Mr. Muto responded it is a no build lot. Mr. Jemmot followed up by asking if there could be agriculture structures and Mr. Muto stated that the specifics will need to be worked out but

that some type of uninhabitable structures would be allowed. He added that we would look at allowing an appropriate scale of agricultural buildings. Mr. Meyer asked if the remainder lot could be a golf course, and Mr. Muto replied that they could not, unless they processed to specifically have a golf course.

Mr. Christianson asked for clarification on the Community Plans being more restrictive, not less restrictive, asking if a decreased minimum lot size is contrary to this principle since a decreased lot size means it is easier to develop a property. Mr. Muto explained that we do not believe it is inconsistent, adding that we would allow a decrease in lot size through the PRD or Lot Area Averaging to achieve the yield in the General Plan. Mr. Woods added that the density it is allowed in the General Plan, but is refined in the Community Plans.

Mr. Neirinckx commented that there is still some confusion on the more restrictive Community Plans, and asked for a clear example of being more restrictive. He added that during consultation of minimum lot sizes with each Planning Group he would like any disagreement between the Planning Group and DPLU it should go to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Mr. Woods commented that the Steering Committee and Planning/Sponsor Groups will not lose their voice, and two recommendations can go to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. He added that he does not know the final outcome will be.

Mr. Woods commented that he thinks the discussion on the Conservation Subdivision is a good exercise to better understand the Conservation Subdivision Program. Mr. Phillips commented that thinks there are similar situations with Valle De Oro and Fallbrook with large parcels in Estate Residential Areas. He explained that in these areas the General Plan density could allow subdivision of the properties, and that if substandard minimum lot sizes are allowed there will be a continual trail of minor subdivisions that cut up these parcels around existing estate homes as these properties are inherited and/or sold. Mr. Phillips added that this is a problem with decreasing minimum lot sizes in village residential densities. Additionally he commented that the program originally was limited to areas less dense then SR-10 and the best protection is for Communities to be allowed to opt out of the Conservation Subdivision Program, but that he is concerned that this program can allow these types of subdivisions with a simple rezone.

Mr. Muto stated that he agrees with Mr. Phillips that this will probably be limited in the Village Areas by-right, and that it will usually require a PRD or Lot Area Averaging. Mr. Phillips noted that his community has seen PRDs in one to two acre zones and was happy with the outcome because they had Major Use Permit findings and that the overall density was about 25% less then what the General Plan was allowed.

Mr. Chism commented that he would like to go back to what Mr. Christianson said regarding an easier development, adding that he thinks at some point it should be discussed what is sustainable as well. He explained that smaller lots use less water, infrastructure, and have less fire issues, and that he would like to get the most out of the development as a region. Mr. Woods commented that this is a good point because this program could have advantages in some places. Mr. Chism followed up that he would like to see ways to control some of

Mr. Phillips valid concerns with B and other design review designators, and added that this tool can help maintain and keep agriculture viable.

Mr. Woods said he would like to have Mr. Muto explain the examples that were requested at the June Steering Committee Meeting and take comments after we see the Conservation Subdivision in action. Mr. Muto explained that these examples were prepared showing how existing subdivisions could have been developed using some tools from the Draft Conservation Subdivision Program.

Mr. Muto explained the project in Alpine that was approved with 15 lots that were 1-2 acres, and that with a Planned Residential Development and Major Use Permit in the Conservation Subdivision could have had 18 lots with .4 to .6 acre lots. Additionally he explained that the project would have had increased the open space, decreased infrastructure costs and added connectivity with the addition of a through road.

Mr. Denham commented he looks at this project and the adjacent lots that have room for a trailer or corral, and asked if it is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Muto replied that there is still room in some of these lots, but that there is also room for protected open space. He added that one of the lots could potentially be a community common lot with added amenities that are looked for in a PRD.

Mr. Woods suggested that the group listen to the remainder of the examples and hold questions until the end. Mr. Muto explained that the Ramona Conservation Subdivision example the additional lot allowed in the General Plan was included, the subdivision decreased the Wildland/Urban Interface Area and increased open space protection. Mr. Denham commented that in many cases in Pine Valley there is open space that can not be built on, and asked if this is protecting areas that are already protected. Mr. Muto responded that the Ramona example is probably building on sensitive areas.

Mr. Phillips commented that it sounds like one of the goals in this program is to add more units, and pointed out that these are significant increases in percentage of units in cumulative units. He stated that he thinks that the density should be no higher then what is achievable with a normal subdivision with public roads. Mr. Woods stated that he does not think it is a goal, but that the original yield was affected by the constraints. Mr. Phillips said that the largest problem with clustering is that it allows yield on unbuildable areas. Mr. Woods followed up that a key point in this is that the General Plan Update decreased the density in many cases.

Mr. Muto reiterated that the constraints were considered with the General Plan Updates Land Use Mapping and has received criticism for decreasing densities on those constraints. He commented that there should be a demonstration that we are providing some support to get these reduced densities, but added that there needs to be environmental findings with a Major Use Permit to obtain these full yields.

Ms. Lowes asked clarification on the 15 1-2 acre lots in the Alpine example were allowed with to be 18 units were not allowed before, noting that the RL-20 example did not increase

the unit yield but only decreased lot size. Mr. Muto explained that this property was allowed 18 units under the General Plan, but was only able to obtain 15 with this project. Mr. Jemmot commented that they are not entitled to the full 18 lots if they only get 15 with regulations. Mr. Muto responded that they may have received the full 18 lots if they had processed a PRD or Lot Area Averaging.

Mr. Woods commented that this that this may be more important with increased pressure for fire protection and the need for defensible space. Mr. Muto explained that the Lakeside example is in a Village Residential area, increased the amount of open space and increased the amount of units. Ms. Lowes asked why these subdivisions need the maximum density, and Mr. Muto responded that it is not a goal but we are providing a mechanism for this. Mr. Woods added that there are two sides of the equation, and that property owners are looking at the rights to their property.

Mr. Meyer stated they have a right to a use, not to the density. Mr. Muto confirmed that they do not have a mandated right to the full buildout of a property, but added that there are times where there are benefits to the community if there is flexibility in the regulation in a situation that could be beneficial to everyone.

Mr. R. Smith asked why Lot Area Averaging and PRDs are no longer acceptable tools, he continued by giving examples of some cases in Lakeside where the applicant comes in with these and other tools, such as mobile home and affordable housing regulations. He added that there may be a need to revamp some of the old tools, but not the need to add a new tool. Mr. Muto stated that that essentially what the program says, to use the PRD and Lot Area Averaging Tools that can be better utilized with the adoption of the new General Plan and improvements to the program.

Mr. Chism stated that simplistically we are looking to try and get better design, and that this approach uses a carrot instead of a stick. He added that the unit increase may not be significant much in his area, and that the more tools to get better design are ok.

Mr. Jemmot stated that a long time ago there was a movie passed around to promote the conservation subdivision. He said that according to the movie the first way to do this was determine the actual yield with the constraints, then rearrange the lots to have more amenities and open space. He added that this way would be more saleable then having smaller lots and increased yield and that a Conservation Subdivisions were no more expensive to build. Mr. Muto commented that there is already a density reduction during the planning process in areas where these are expected to occur, and that now how the yield is calculated. Mr. Jemmot asked if it is the opinion of staff has taken account the sensitive habitats and Mr. Muto replied that it is.

Mr. Woods commented that this is an important point, and that by playing devils advocate the other side will say you already decreased my density and would like to receive what is now allowed. Additionally, he said that the details and how often it should be should be used is still to be discussed.

Mr. Phillips commented that the devil is in the details, and the proposed modifications take out the key element of compatibility, minimum lot sizes. He stated that the whole benefit of this program is that there will be larger tracks of open space, but that the big problem is that the open space on private lots has to have a conservation easement. He explained that after 15 years of someone living on that lot it is theirs, no matter what easements exist. Mr. Phillips also said that there is even higher risk with separate designated open space lots, that although the intent is to dedicate this to a conservation organization but that in his experience it can be dedicated to a master developer. Mr. Muto stated the intent is to not allow the dedication to be to a master developer, and once we get past the general discussion and get into the more details we can make sure to preserve open space in perpetuity. Mr. Phillips said the Draft Program states that the open space may not even require an easement placed on it, which is the minimum control that should be required of a conservation program.

Mr. Woods stated that Mr. Phillips has good comments, and as staff refines the Conservation Subdivision Program that is one of the areas they can look at refining. Mr. Muto explained that the reason that statement was included is because there are conservation agencies that will not take land into their ownership and maintenance if there is an easement, adding that there needs to be a way to allow for dedication to allow the land transfer.

Mr. Phillips gave the example that Rancho San Diego has thousands of acres of open space that was held onto by the master developer early on in the development, and after it was sold and resold there was every kind of proposal that you can imagine. He explained that it was not clear that the land was to be used for biological open space and that if a conservation organization will not accept land with an easement you have to wonder what the reason is for.

Ms. Esry stated that there is a nightmare scenario in her area, with a 3,000 acre ranch looking to put 400 units on 6,600 square foot lots. She explained that she has concerns that the DPLU Planner and Supervisor do not know the community and do not want to see the small lots of the Campo Hills repeated or used as a precedent. Ms. Esry stated that this is unfair to allow while other property is taken to 1 dwelling unit per 80 acres, and commented that she thinks there is a good chance that star ranch is going to be approved. Mr. Muto explained that the example project is not processing with a PRD or Lot Area Averaging, which have findings effect the outcome, it is a General Plan Amendment and not representative under the program.

Mr. Woods commented that he understands what they are saying. Ms. Radzik asked if water delivery is assumed in each of these projects, and Mr. Muto replied that these were examples created quickly by staff, but that there would need to be a service agreement from the water agency with each of the projects.

Mr. Neirinckx asked if this program partially reflects the downzoning that has occurred with the General Plan Update. He said this is a mechanism that would even the plain a little bit when his group does not support all downzoned areas, but that his concern is when it is applied to areas that were not downzoned in the General Plan Update.

Mr. Noland commented that there is a developer in Boulevard who would like to take 8,000 acres out of the General Plan Update to make his own plan, but is concerned that the neighboring properties will be allowed to match 6,600 square lots adjacent to them under the conservation subdivisions.

Mr. Anderson commented that examples 1 and 4 increase the fire risk and that number 1 does not conform to the table of densities. He added that one of his concerns is, check the tape.

Ms. Goodman asked about open space easements and the problems with agencies going bankrupt. Mr. Muto stated that there were some agencies that have gone bankrupt, but there are many that have with good resources and are going to be looking into these details worked out to make sure this is managed properly.

Ms. Stonehouse stated that the Sweetwater CPG thinks this is an amazing thing, adding that Sweetwater is built out with very little open space and thinks that if there was this 30 years ago there would be less population in her area than exists today. Ms. Stonehouse commented that the people who go out into the rural areas generally go out to have land and if these types of development are allowed there will be people moving in with less interest in preserving the land.

Mr. Woods stated that the group should take a break. There was a break at 10:45, the meeting resumed at 11:07.

Mr. Woods called the meeting to order and stated that it was requested for public comment on the Conservation Subdivision. Mr. Palmer commented that it would be easier for him to understand the maps if there were actual constraints shown. Mr. Woods confirmed that there could be a more complete shown with constraints picture.

Mr. Woods asked if there were any other comments from the group and then asked Mr. Muto to go over the remaining example. Mr. Muto described that there is four lots in the project that is an example of how this can be applied to agriculture, with 4 lots of smaller size, a portion dedicated for preservation but an area as an agriculture lot.

Ms Esry commented that Mr. Phillips has done a wonderful job, and that the incompatible lifestyles of people moving into smaller lots is important. Mr. Woods commented that one of the important aspects is that in order for a conservation subdivision to work it would need a Major Use Permit, which provides for a large amount of community input. Mr. Muto also added that in a project like the Agricultural example in Bonsall that a notice would be given to new homeowners informing them that they are next to an agricultural area.

Mr. Denham about the agriculture use and if it would be continued with the approved subdivision, Mr. Woods replied that there was a low likelihood that the existing agriculture would be continued.

Mr. Meyer asked who would control the agricultural area, Mr. Muto responded that it could associate with one of the other lots and that staff can look into having a separate agricultural lot.

Mr. R. Smith asked who would be the title holder of the Open Space and agricultural lots. Mr. Muto clarified that they could be part of the other lots or be given to a conservation agency, but that we separated them out to make the graphic cleaner. Mr. Smith commented that if the easement was on the same parcel as the other lots then it is going to be disrupted.

Mr. Jemmott commented that the agriculture operations in this county are sustainable on four acres, Mr. Muto commented that the Bonsall example had a grading plan for large lots with large homes that would not leave much room for agriculture. Mr. Jemmott noted that he thinks four acres allows for a large residential area and still agricultural area. Mr. Muto agreed that in many cases smaller lots are more viable, but that in other cases we want to allow for other methods to occur if they are more viable to retain agriculture. Mr. Jemmott asked that if this is all of the agriculture is on one parcel and it loses its water rights then what good is a preserve if it is not economically viable. Mr. Woods commented that in planning we can only provide for the opportunity.

Mr. Chism said that the opportunity could be larger for crops that we do not know about yet. He noted that a farmer is not going to grow anything if they are not going to make money, and there is more opportunity for diversity on a larger parcel. Mr. Chism also stated that currently smaller lots are more viable, but someone can buy them and decide they do not want to grow anymore.

Ms. Radzik said that in providing this type of development many people do paperwork before they do their homework, commenting that potential developers should go before the Planning Groups before they spend a lot of money and that water delivery is a critical item. Mr. Muto said that he agrees and that the county would like to prepare design guidelines for rural subdivisions and to prepare a guide for the people considering development to look at each issue that will pertain to them.

Mr. Woods asked Mr. Muto what the future is going to be on the discussion. Mr. Muto said the next step is to take these comments and implement them into the details, he said we need to draft up the language so the group can review it. Ms. Lowes asked that if the community is opposed to this type of construction they put it into their community plan that it will not be allowed, Mr. Muto replied that it is in the General Plan so we would prefer to automatically restrict it in the Community Plans. He added that it is ultimately up to the decision makers.

Mr. Muto stated that this is not indented for communities that are mostly built-out, more for the semi-rural and rural lands. He stated that we think we can say there are limited opportunities for it in the Community Plan, but would prefer to not specifically disallow it.

Ms. Radzik asked if there is any disclosure that this is not a legal requirement at the state level. Mr. Muto replied this is not required but we are essentially amending our legal

requirements, that this Program is a complete change from what was being proposed before, and that a disclosure is probably not necessary.

Mr. Jemmot stated that the Board of Supervisors clarified that the process is supposed to be bottom up, Mr. Muto agreed that the direction was continue to be bottom up as it has been and Mr. Jemmot disagreed that it has. Mr. Muto stated that that staff also still has direction that the Interest Group remains a part of this process. He added that that we think this is a bottom up process, and commented that the Draft Land Use Element and Original Conservation Subdivision Programs were changed to address that concern.

Mr. Jemmot stated that he believes that bottoms up means that the Planning and Sponsor Groups can opt out of the Conservation Subdivisions to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Woods reminded the Steering Committee that this group can have a different opinion then what staff has.

Mr. Denham said that clustering may be appropriate in areas like El Cajon, but added that it is not appropriate in groundwater dependant areas. He added that there are projects processing in the county today in the early years of a 30 year drought that do not match community character. Mr. Muto clarified that the project in question is a general plan amendment that is being processed today and is not consistent with the General Plan Update. He explained that we would be looking at the same number of units pulling out the same amount of water with the Groundwater Ordinance, but that they would need to do a groundwater study. Mr. Denham stated that an area like Jacumba there is greater recharge, but that the recharge is dependant on precipitation and hopes that the county is on our side. Mr. Muto confirmed that the county is on the communities side.

Mr. Anderson said that the road systems that were in place 30 years ago do not support clustered developments and this should be improved. Mr. Muto commented that we are looking at trying to improve the road standards to be more in character with the communities.

Mr. Woods said he would like to let staff go back and have something that we can bring it back to the group for review. Mr. Christianson stated that he likes clustering arrangements, that it is efficient use of lands, and that it makes agriculture more opportunistic because you can afford to hire a manager. He applauds what you are trying to do, and thinks it is a very good thing, but he is concerned with “supersized” lots in rural areas that changes the character of the community with people who move into an area to find the house, not the community. He would like controls for the Planning Groups when they look at minimum lot sizes and other community. Mr. Woods asked the group to remember that Community Character is still a finding in a Major Use Permit, and Mr. Muto mentioned that this is a reason we are updating the Community Plans and have these Vision Statements and Community Character sections adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Phillips stated that when we last looked at the subject there was a motion tabled, and that it is entitled to come back. He explained that it is written on his handout, but that it does not establish opposition to the Conservation Subdivision but it says what this committee finds a

problem with this draft version. He noted that Devon has made some commitments to alter the draft version, but would like it on record with a motion.

Phillips: Motion: The Steering Committee opposes the concept of disassociating normally-expected minimum lot sizes (zone box) from General Plan densities or any form of “by right” clustering. Further, the committee finds the proposed minimum parcel sizes to be too small for compatibility in our unincorporated communities and the proposed open-space preservation methods to be ineffective for preservation in perpetuity.

**Christianson: Second
Motion Passes 17-1-2**

Mr. Woods asked if the group wants to see the Conservation Subdivision Details and the group agreed that they would like to see it. Mr. R. Smith said he would like to see it and is thinking of changing his mind and is going to take it back to his Planning Group and change their position. Mr. Christianson stated that he thinks the motion is a positive statement, not negative.

Mr. Neirinckx asked about min lot sizes in regard to slope, adding that he thinks it should be considered in the Conservation Subdivision. Mr. Chism said that in a large lot putting houses on the high point is an important issue, and that in some cases is acceptable. Ms. Esry said she wants to see this again, and noted that there is place for this, however maybe not in Campo/Lake Morena.

Mr. Phillips commented that in the Valle De Oro Community Plan there is slope criteria and thinks they should consider putting it in the Jamul/Dulzura Community Plan on hillsides. He noted that there are areas that have 4.3 du/acre on steep slope. Mr. Frey noted that this may go beyond the slope to fire safety, noting that when houses are more densely compact they can catch each other on fire, and that if they are more spread out there is difficulty protecting them all. He also commented that if there is an improperly managed conservation area that it can increase the fire danger. Mr. Phillips commented that Rancho Bernardo is a classic example.

IV. Discussion of Draft Land Use Element

Mr. Woods asked Mr. Muto to review the Land Use Element handout. Mr. Muto described the items and said we can discuss it more at the next meeting. He explained that on the request for a density bonus exception on Groundwater Dependant areas the County is forming the legislative agenda for the next year and will be pursuing it.

Mr. Muto stated that at the other meeting there were comments on the Floor Area Ratio with concerns and requests for exceptions, and showed the revisions for the group to review. He stated that the revisions address a small portion of the comments and that we should likely come back and discuss. He noted that some areas the Fallbrook Village that would need an FAR of 2.0 and that we need to provide for some level of exception in areas.

He explained that these are the proposed revisions to policy 2.15 following the last meeting and that any changes can be looked at another time.

Mr. Denham, asked when the next meeting will be and Mr. stated it was tentatively scheduled for October 25th. Phillips noted that is right before the election.

V. Public Comments

Mr. Crawley asked if FAR could be placed in the Potrero Community Plan. Mr. Muto said we would like to describe the character of the development we would like to see, then we can put the actual standard in the zoning ordinance.

Meeting Adjourned 11:56